REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-30, 32 and 35-38 were pending prior to this amendment. Claims 1, 5-30, 32 and 35-38 were rejected. By virtue of this response, no claims are cancelled, claims 1, 13, 22, 27, 28, and 29 have been amended, and no new claims have been added. (Claims 2-4, 31, 33-34, and 39-43 were canceled in previous responses.) Accordingly, claims 1, 5-30, 32 and 35-38 are currently under consideration after entry of this amendment.

The amendment to paragraph 00026 of the specification simply corrects a typographical error (replacing "organometalic" with "organometallic.")

The amendments to claims 1, 27, and 29 ("...or close to the CIE coordinates of, pure white light...") are supported at paragraph 0009, page 4 of the instant specification. The amendments to claim 22 replace the symbol "~" with the word "about," and delete superfluous verbiage. A typographical error was inadvertently introduced into claim 28 in the amendment mailed September 7, 2006 and received September 11, 2006; this amendment replaces "tetraphenyldiaminc" with "tetraphenyldiamino" to restore the correct original spelling.

The amendments to claims 1, 13, 27, and 29 ("...wherein the emission from the at least one admixed phosphorescent emitter is predominantly exciton emission") are implicitly supported at, *inter alia*, paragraph 00031, pages 9-10 (hole trapping on $Ir(HFP)_3$ followed by electron trapping on $Ir(HFP)_3^+$, resulting in an exciton), at paragraph 00032, page 10, and at paragraph 00045, page 13.

With respect to any claim amendments or cancellations, Applicants have not dedicated to the public or abandoned any unclaimed subject matter and moreover have not acquiesced to any rejections and/or objections made by the Patent and Trademark Office. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue prosecution of any presently excluded subject matter or claim embodiments in one or more future continuation and/or divisional application(s).

For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants' remarks are presented in the same order in which they were raised in the Office Action.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 5-30, 32 and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Thompson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,869,695.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The instant claims recite that the phosphorescent emission occurs predominantly from exciton emission. That is, the phosphorescent emission occurs predominantly from recombination of charge carriers on the same molecule. See the discussion under "Mechanism" in the instant specification at paragraph 00031, pages 9-10. See also Example 7, paragraph 00045, page 13, demonstrating that white light emission occurs at relatively low Ir(HFP)$_3$ concentration, where exciton recombination (recombination of charge carriers on the same molecule) predominates, while higher concentrations of Ir(HFP)$_3$ result in red light emission rather than white light emission. In contrast, in Thompson, phosphorescent emission occurs from an aggregate, that is, a group of associated compounds (i.e., an excimer or exciplex). See, for example, column 5, lines 58-60 of Thompson U.S. 6,869,695, reciting "[w]hite emission is achieved from two luminescent emitters in a single emissive region through the formation of an aggregate by one of the lumophores," and also column 8, lines 6-11, stating "[w]hite emission is achieved from two luminescent emitters in a single emissive region through the formation of an aggregate by one of the lumophores. The aggregate emitter comprises two or more emissive molecules or moieties that are bound in the ground state and/or in the excited state." As Thompson indicates at column 11, lines 38-63, the emissive layer requires high concentrations of a dopant in order to ensure formation of an excimer or exciplex for aggregate emission. Thompson states that "[a]t appropriate concentrations, it is possible to get high monomer and excimer emission from the same dopant" (see column 11, lines 38-39) and "[i]n order to achieve more efficient white emission from a single dopant (via simultaneous monomer and excimer emission), the doping level leading to balanced emission should be increased" (see column 12, lines 7-10), and thus Thompson clearly indicates that aggregate emission is present in the devices of U.S. 6,869,695 and that monomer emission does not predominate.

While U.S. 6,869,695 mentions Ir(ppz)$_3$ (in Figure 18, in the descriptions of Figs. 12 and 18, and in Example 2, column 18, lines 33 and 46),[1] Ir(ppz)$_3$ is used as an electron blocking layer in a region outside the emissive region of the devices of U.S. 6,869,695, as indicated in Example 2, column 18, lines 46-48, not as a component of the emissive layer.

---

[1] These locations were identified by searching for the string "ppz" in the full text of U.S. 6,86,695 available at http://www.uspto.gov/patft/index.html, locating the string occurrences in the printed patent, and reviewing Figs. 12 and 18.

The recitation in the instant claims of phosphorescence predominantly from exciton emission, distinct from emission from an aggregate, obviates the rejection over Thompson et al. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 220002071600. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: April 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Robert K. Cerpa/
Robert K. Cerpa
Registration No.: 39,933
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-5715